



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,933	01/04/2002	Rohan Coelho	42390P11783	8489

7590 03/02/2006

James H. Salter
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

GLASS, RUSSELL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/038,933

Applicant(s)

COELHO ET AL

Examiner

Russell S. Glass

Art Unit

3626

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 October 2002.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/8/04 10/28/04
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. **Claims 1-10, and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.** In particular, the claims fail to describe who or what is performing the method steps. For example, claim 1 fails to describe what is "receiving a request for the health information from across an internal network".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1-6, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snowden et al., (U.S. Pub. 2002/0026332) in view of Intel Internet Authentication Services, Privacy and Security for Health Care Transactions Over the Internet, copyright©2000 Intel Corporation.**

Art Unit: 3626

3. The collective system of Snowden and Intel discloses a method of controlling transfer of health information along a network pathway. Intel fails to disclose acquiring patient consent for transfer of medical records. Intel does disclose acquiring authorization for medical records. Controlling distribution of medical records based on patient consent is well-known in the art as evidenced by Snowden, (Snowden, *passim*). Intel further discloses the following method steps:

- (a) receiving a request for the health information from across an internal network, the request being generated from a portable healthcare device, (Intel, p. 4, Fig. 1, col. 1, ¶ 2 and 3; p. 6, col. 2, ¶ 3) (An internal network is considered to be equivalent to a virtual private network since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results) (A portable healthcare device is considered to be equivalent to a PDA since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results);
- (b) immediately determining if a corresponding authentication is stored, (Intel, p. 4, col. 1, ¶ 1, 2; p. 5, col. 2, ¶ 2 and 3); and
- (c) if the corresponding authentication is stored, permitting the health information to be immediately acquired by sending the request across an external network to be obtained by a remote site, receiving the health information from the remote site, and forwarding the health information back across the internal network, (Intel, p. 5, col. 3, ¶ 2) (Remote site is considered to be equivalent to third party database since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the authorization in Intel with the patient consent from Snowden. The motivation would be to provide a secure repository for personal medical records of individuals and families, (Snowden, Abstract).

4. As per claim 2, Intel further discloses the forwarding of the health information is to the portable healthcare device, (Intel, p. 4, Fig. 1, col. 1, ¶ 2 and 3; p. 6, col. 2, ¶ 3).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authorization with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

5. As per claim 3, Intel further discloses sending a notice to the portable healthcare device, (Intel, p. 5, col 2, ¶ 3) (sending a notice is considered to be equivalent to granting immediate access since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authorization with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

6. As per claim 4, Intel further discloses receiving the appropriate authentication from the portable healthcare device and permitting the health information to be immediately acquired by sending the request across an external network to a remote site, receiving the health information from the remote site, and forwarding the health information back across the internal network, (Intel, p. 5, col 2, ¶ 2- end of page).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authorization with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

7. As per claim 5, Intel further discloses a method wherein the corresponding consent is fingerprint data, retinal data, voice data, or a digital signature data and further including comparing the corresponding consent with stored consent data, (Intel, p. 6, col. 2, ¶ 3).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authorization with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

8. As per claim 6, Intel further discloses including determining if authentication is required prior to the determining if a corresponding authentication is stored, and if the authentication is not required, permitting the health information to be immediately acquired by sending the request across an external network to a remote site, receiving the health information from the remote site, and forwarding the health information back across the internal network, (Intel, p. 5, col. 2, ¶ 2 and col. 3, ¶ 2) (Determining if authentication is required is considered to be equivalent determining whether or not a user computer is enabled for streamlined access since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authorization with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

9. As per claim 8, Intel further discloses including determining the suitability of a corresponding authentication, (Intel, p. 3, col. 1, ¶ 2 and 3) (Determining the suitability of a corresponding consent is considered to be equivalent to confirmed and relative authentication since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authorization with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

10. As per claim 11, Intel discloses a health information access server, comprising:

- (a) an internal network port to receive a request for health information from a portable healthcare device for a user, (Intel, p. 4, Fig. 1, col. 1, ¶ 2 and 3; p. 6, col. 2, ¶ 3) (An internal network is considered to be equivalent to a virtual private network since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results) (A portable healthcare device is considered to be equivalent to a PDA since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results);
- (b) an authentication database to store consents corresponding to health information, (Intel, p. 4, col. 1, ¶ 1, 2; p. 5, col. 2, ¶ 2, 3);
- (c) a search engine to determine if a corresponding authentication is stored in the database for requested health information, (Intel, p. 4, col. 1, ¶ 1, 2; p. 5, col. 2, ¶ 2, 3) (a search engine is considered to be equivalent to IAS since it performs an identical

Art Unit: 3626

function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results);

and

(d) a server interface to prepare the request for receipt by a next segment in the network pathway towards a remote site, and to prepare the health information sent in response from the remote site to be received by a next segment in the network pathway towards the user, (Intel, p. 4, col. 1, ¶ 1, 2; p. 5, col. 3, ¶ 2) (a server interface is considered to be equivalent to IAS since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results).

Intel fails to disclose controlling distribution of medical records based on patient consent. Controlling distribution of medical records based on patient consent is well-known in the art as evidenced by Snowden, (Snowden, *passim*).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace the authorization in Intel with the patient consent from Snowden. The motivation would be to provide a secure repository for personal medical records of individuals and families, (Snowden, Abstract).

11. As per claim 12, Intel discloses an information access server, further including an authentication analysis unit to determine the suitability of a corresponding authentication, (Intel, p. 3, col. 1, ¶ 2 and 3) (a consent analysis unit is considered to be equivalent to IAS since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authorization with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and

Art Unit: 3626

incorporated herein by reference.

12. As per claim 13, Intel discloses an information access server, further including a request identification unit to determine the appropriate remote site to receive the request, (Intel, p. 4, col. 1, ¶ 1, 2; p. 5, col. 3, ¶ 2) (a request identification unit is considered to be equivalent to IAS since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results) (a request identification unit is considered to be equivalent to IAS since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authorization with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

13. Claim 25 contains substantially the same limitations as claim 3. Therefore, the grounds for the rejection of claim 3, and the statements of obviousness and motivations to combine are incorporated herein by reference.

14. Claim 26 contains substantially the same limitations as claim 4. Therefore, the grounds for the rejection of claim 4, and the statements of obviousness and motivations to combine are incorporated herein by reference.

15. Claim 27 contains substantially the same limitations as claim 5. Therefore, the grounds for the rejection of claim 5, and the statements of obviousness and motivations to combine are incorporated herein by reference.

16. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snowden et al., (U.S. Pub. 2002/0026332) in view of Intel Internet Authentication Services, Privacy and Security for Health Care Transactions Over the Internet, copyright©2000 Intel Corporation and further in view the Background of the Invention.

17. As per claim 7, Intel fails to disclose that the remote site could be a pharmacy benefits manager. However, a pharmacy benefit manager is well known in the art as evidenced by the Background of the Invention, (Background, ¶ 4).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Intel with the Background of the Invention. The motivation would be to allow efficient authentication systems to businesses such as pharmacies and insurance companies, (Intel, p. 3, col. 3, ¶ 1).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authorization with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

18. Claims 9, 10, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snowden et al., (U.S. Pub. 2002/0026332) in view of Intel Internet Authentication Services, Privacy and Security for Health Care Transactions Over the Internet, copyright©2000 Intel Corporation and further in view of Wong et al., (6,260,021).

Art Unit: 3626

19. As per claim 9, Intel fails to disclose a method further including placing the request in a wrapper for acceptance by a next segment in the network pathway towards the remote site. However, such a method step is well known in the art as evidenced by Wong.

Wong discloses a method further including placing the request in a wrapper for acceptance by a next segment in the network pathway towards the remote site, (Wong, Fig. 1; col. 11, line 65-col. 12, line 5).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Intel and Wong. The motivation would be to provide communication between network sites that lack common communication protocols, (Wong, col. 11, line 65-col. 12, line 5).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authorization with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

20. As per claim 10, Intel fails to disclose a method further including unwrapping health information received from across and external network. However, such a method step is inherent in the art disclosed by Wong.

Wong discloses a method further including placing the request in a wrapper for acceptance by a next segment in the network pathway towards the remote site, (Wong, Fig. 1; col. 11, line 65-col. 12, line 5). It would be inherent for the remote site to perform an unwrapping function on the received information. Unwrapping is necessary for the wrapped information to be effectively utilized by the remote site computer.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Intel and Wong. The motivation would be to provide communication between network sites that lack common communication protocols, (Wong, col. 11, line 65-col. 12, line 5).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authorization with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

21. As per claim 15, Intel fails to disclose an information access server further including a health information identification unit to determine what type of information is received. However, such an information access server is well-known in the art as evidenced by Wong, (Wong, col. 2, line 65-col. 3, line 3; col. 3, line 60 - col. 5, line 20; col. 11, lines 17-28) (a health information identification unit is considered to be equivalent to a system comprising an interface engine and image object coordinator since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Intel and Wong. The motivation would be to provide communication between network sites that lack common communication protocols, (Wong, col. 11, line 65-col. 12, line 5).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authorization with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

Art Unit: 3626

22. As per claim 16, Intel fails to disclose an information access server further including an application unit to determine an appropriate software application program for the health information to be entered into. However, such an information access server is well-known in the art as evidenced by Wong, (Wong, col. 2, line 65-col. 3, line 3; col. 3, line 60 - col. 5, line 20; col. 11, lines 17-28) (an application unit is considered to be equivalent to a system comprising an interface engine and image object coordinator since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Intel and Wong. The motivation would be to provide communication between network sites that lack common communication protocols, (Wong, col. 11, line 65-col. 12, line 5).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authorization with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

23. **Claims 16-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snowden et al., (U.S. Pub. 2002/0026332) in view of Intel Internet Authentication Services, Privacy and Security for Health Care Transactions Over the Internet, copyright©2000 Intel Corporation, and further in view of Killcommons et al., (U.S. 6,424,996).**

Art Unit: 3626

24. As per claim 16, Killcommons discloses a computer accessible medium having stored therein a plurality of sequences of executable instructions, which, when executed by a processor, cause the system to:

- (a) process a request for the health information, (Killcommons, col. 4, line 54-col. 5, line 22);
- (b) permit the health information to be immediately acquired, (Killcommons, col. 2, lines 45-50; col. 4, line 54-col. 5, line 22).

Killcommons fails to disclose a computer accessible medium having stored therein a plurality of sequences of executable instructions, which, when executed by a processor, cause the system to receive health information from across an internal network, the request being generated from a portable healthcare device, immediately determine if an corresponding consent is stored; and if the corresponding consent is stored, permit the health information to be immediately acquired by sending the request across an external network to a remote site, receive the health information from the remote site, and forward the health information back across the internal network.

However, such software is well-known in the art as evidenced by Intel, (Intel, p. 4, Fig. 1, col. 1, ¶ 1- 3; p. 6, col. 2, ¶ 3; p. 5, col. 2, ¶ 2 and 3)(see also rejection of claim 1).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Killcommons and the collective system of Snowden and Intel. The motivation would be to assemble and communicate multimedia information from a variety of modalities to remote users, (Killcommons, Abstract).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authentication with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 1 and incorporated herein by reference.

25. As per claim 17, Intel further discloses the forwarding of the health information is to the portable healthcare device, (Intel, p. 6, col. 2, ¶ 3).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Killcommons, Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authentication with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 16 and incorporated herein by reference.

26. As per claim 18, Intel further discloses that if no corresponding authentication is stored, further including additional sequences of executable instructions, which, when executed by the processor further cause the system to send a notice to the portable healthcare device, (Intel, p. 5, col 2, ¶ 3) (sending a notice is considered to be equivalent to granting immediate access since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Killcommons, Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authentication with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 16 and incorporated herein by reference.

27. As per claim 19, Intel further discloses that if no corresponding authentication is stored, further including additional sequences of executable instructions, which, when executed by the processor further cause the system to receive the appropriate authentication from the portable healthcare device and to permit the health information to be immediately acquired by sending the request across an external network to a

Art Unit: 3626

remote site, receiving the health information from the remote site, and forwarding the health information back across the internal network, (Intel, p. 2, col. 3, ¶ 2-p. 3, col. 1, ¶ 3; p. 5, col 2, ¶ 2,- end of page).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Killcommons, Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authentication with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 16 and incorporated herein by reference.

28. As per claim 20, Intel further discloses that the corresponding authentication is fingerprint data, retinal data, voice data, or a digital signature data and further including comparing the corresponding authentication with stored authentication data, (Intel, p. 6, col. 2, ¶ 3).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Killcommons, Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authentication with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 16 and incorporated herein by reference.

29. As per claim 21, Intel further discloses further including additional sequences of executable instructions, which, when executed by the processor further cause the system to determine if authentication is required and if the authentication is not required, to permit the health information to be immediately acquired by sending the request across an external network to a remote site, receiving the health information from the remote site, and forwarding the health information back across the internal network, (Intel, p. 5, col. 2, ¶ 2 and col. 3, ¶ 2) (Determining if consent is required is considered to be equivalent determining whether or not a user computer is enabled for

streamlined access since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Killcommons, Snowden and Intel, thus replacing authentication with consent, is as discussed in the rejection of claim 16 and incorporated herein by reference.

30. As per claim 22, Intel further discloses further including additional sequences of executable instructions, which, when executed by the processor further cause the system determine the suitability of a corresponding authentication, (Intel, p. 3, col. 1, ¶ 2 and 3) (Determining the suitability of a corresponding consent is considered to be equivalent to confirmed and relative authentication since it performs an identical function in substantially the same way and produces substantially the same results).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to combine Killcommons, Snowden and Intel is as discussed in the rejection of claim 16 and incorporated herein by reference.

31. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Snowden et al., (U.S. Pub. 2002/0026332) in view of Intel Internet Authentication Services, Privacy and Security for Health Care Transactions Over the Internet, copyright©2000 Intel Corporation, and further in view of Killcommons et al., (U.S. 6,424,996) and further in view of Wong et al., (6,260,021).

32. As per claim 23, The collective system of Killcommons and Intel fails to disclose a computer accessible medium, further including additional sequences of executable instructions, which, when executed by the processor further cause the system to placing

Art Unit: 3626

the request in a wrapper for acceptance by a next segment in the network pathway towards the remote site. However, such executable instructions are well known in the art as evidenced by Wong.

Wong discloses executable instructions further including placing the request in a wrapper for acceptance by a next segment in the network pathway towards the remote site, (Wong, Fig. 1; col. 11, line 65–col. 12, line 5).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Intel and Wong. The motivation would be to provide communication between network sites that lack common communication protocols, (Wong, col. 11, line 65–col. 12, line 5).

The motivation to create the collective system of Snowden, Intel and Killcommons is as provided in the rejection of claim 16 and incorporated herein by reference.

33. As per claim 24, the collective system of Killcommons and Intel fails to disclose a computer accessible medium, further including additional sequences of executable instructions, which, when executed by the processor further cause the system to interrupt a processor to unwrap health information received from across and external network. However, such executable instructions are inherent in the art disclosed by Wong.

Wong discloses executable instructions further including placing the request in a wrapper for acceptance by a next segment in the network pathway towards the remote site, (Wong, Fig. 1; col. 11, line 65–col. 12, line 5). It would be inherent for the remote

Art Unit: 3626

site to perform an unwrapping function on the received information. Unwrapping is necessary for the wrapped information to be effectively utilized by the remote site computer.

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Intel and Wong. The motivation would be to provide communication between network sites that lack common communication protocols, (Wong, col. 11, line 65-col. 12, line 5).

The statement of obviousness and motivation to create the collective system of Snowden, Intel and Killcommons is as provided in the rejection of claim 16 and incorporated herein by reference.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is as follows: Turner et al., (U.S. Pub. 2003/0177030); Soong, (U.S. 6,941,271); Schoenburg, (U.S. 6,463,417); Moshfeghi et al., (6,076,166); Mayaud, (U.S. 5,845,255).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Russell S. Glass whose telephone number is 571-272-3132. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.


Art Unit: 3626

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RSG
12/01/05

RSG


JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER